

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO

DORIS CRUMBLEY,

Plaintiff,

vs.

COMMISSIONER OF SOCIAL SECURITY,

Defendant.

:
:
:
:
:
:
:
:
:
:
:

Case No. 1:17-cv-2096

OPINION & ORDER
[Resolving Doc. 1]

JAMES S. GWIN, UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE:

On August 16, 2013, Plaintiff Doris Crumbley filed an application for disability insurance benefits with the Social Security Administration (the “SSA”).¹ And, on September 27, 2013, she filed an application for supplemental security income with the SSA.² In both applications, Plaintiff alleged that she became disabled on January 19, 2013.³

On September 30, 2013, the SSA denied both applications.⁴ The SSA then denied Plaintiff’s request for reconsideration on January 9, 2014.⁵ Plaintiff Crumbley then requested an ALJ hearing,⁶ which occurred on June 22, 2015.⁷ Shortly thereafter, the ALJ issued a partially favorable decision, concluding that Plaintiff was disabled, but that her disability began on September 4, 2014, rather than January 13, 2013, as Plaintiff had claimed.⁸ Plaintiff Crumbley sought review of that decision by the Social Security Appeals Council. The Appeals Council denied her request.⁹

Plaintiff then brought this suit, requesting review of the ALJ’s decision.¹⁰ Specifically, Plaintiff claims that: (i) the ALJ failed to consider her back pain and mental problems as “severe impairments”

¹ Doc. 13 at 220-26.

² *Id.* at 227-32.

³ *Id.* at 220, 227.

⁴ *Id.* at 88-113.

⁵ *Id.* at 116-43.

⁶ *Id.* at 171-72.

⁷ *Id.* at 43-83.

⁸ *Id.* at 14-42.

⁹ *Id.* at 1-13.

¹⁰ Doc. 1.

and (ii) the ALJ incorrectly concluded that Plaintiff was capable of performing work that existed in significant numbers in the national economy in the time before September 4, 2014.¹¹ Magistrate Judge Greenberg has considered Plaintiff's case and recommends that the Court affirm the ALJ's decision.¹² Neither Plaintiff nor Defendant have objected to that recommendation.

If a party had objected to the Magistrate Judge's recommendation, the Court would consider the objected-to portions of the recommendation *de novo*.¹³ Because neither party has objected, the Court may adopt the Report and Recommendation without review.¹⁴

Moreover, the Court has conducted its own review of the briefing and record and agrees with the conclusions in the Report and Recommendation.

Accordingly, the Court **ADOPTS** the Magistrate Judge's Report and Recommendation and **AFFIRMS** the ALJ's decision.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: September 13, 2018

s/ James S. Gwin
JAMES S. GWIN
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

¹¹ *Id.*

¹² Doc. 21.

¹³ 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1).

¹⁴ *Thomas v. Arn*, 474 U.S. 140, 149 (1985).